July 6, 1971

Dear Harold,

I've a moment now in an incredibly hectic day to answer your latest mailing. Just sent off my forms, etc. to copyright office. My book is now legally published, and I start the task of getting it really published. Will try the big places first. Am also preparing fora welcome camping trip starting tomorrow.

You sent me some things to return for your copies files. I'll have to delay slightly on that. My Xeroxing facilaty is on strike and I must wait before I can do any. I would think there was no hurry for what you sent--copies of Kliendienst letters and one from Army.

Re your letter to Salant, may I offer some contructive criticism. It was a good letter. But for what? If you intended anything to come of it which either now or in the future would benefit you, the tone and XXXXXXXXXXXXX presentation of the letter will almost surely make that impossible. You can make your points more effectively without posing rhetorical-sounding and indicting questions. Salant isn't interested in your moralizing when you present it as if you were something above him, watching him and pointing an accusing finger when he does wrong. Instead of saying something with so much spleen as "'Freedom of Information,' Mr. Salant?" Why not something along the lines that you are concerned that the press seems to be guilty of the same vices of which it accuses the government, and how dangerous this is considering the vital role of a truly free press in a democratic society.

I look upon your approach to the media in a different perspective than your approach to the bastards in the gov't. With them I can see the venting of spleen to a point. I can see pointing the accusing finger at them. People like Kliendienst should be spared nothing. And no matter how much invective, etc., you use, they must still treat you equally under the law. But the media cannot give equal attention to every issue and what they choose to devote more to is their business, as repugnant as you may find it. The fairness doctrine is one thing, but you are certainly limited as to what extent you can invoke it. It is not always a matter of law that the media give you attention, and when it is you do not have the means to invoke the law. The more you cast aspersions on the media as you do, the less they will have to do with you. You don't have to kiss their asses, but you don't have to take a holier-than-thou attitude with them.

Glad to hear you are working on Tiger. You have practically all the withdrawal stuff, which was copied from Sauer's material. You should find much in my paper, recently sent to you. The only other thing of your's I have that is relevent is the clippings on the O'Donnell revelation which I'll return soon as I can copy for myself. When I can copy, will also send complete American Uni. speech, which I have.

Please write objectively. You extreme style will not do for this type of book. This does not mean you have to use "ice for ink." Just avoid too many rhetorical questions, too many insertions of questionable relevance which break up the development of your points, etc. And document everything! Including page numbers, dates of papers, etc. I would like to read this as you get it done. I predict it will have to be rewritten, and if no one else will do it, I can probably handle some. This is too important a book to settle for anything less than the best possible presentation.

Good luck,

Howard

P.S. Regards to Lil.